



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/537,512	11/27/2006	Berkley Lynch	053529-5007-02	4773
9629 7590 03/19/2009 MORGAN LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP 1111 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE NW WASHINGTON, DC 20004				
EXAMINER				
BALLARD, KIMBERLY				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1649				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/19/2009		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/537,512

**Applicant(s)**

LYNCH ET AL.

**Examiner**

Kimberly Ballard

**Art Unit**

1649

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 November 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-72 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-72 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/CDC)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Election/Restrictions*

Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claim(s) 1-5, 53-55, drawn to a method of treating a neurological disorder associated with synaptic vesicle function, endocrinopathy or hormonal diseases, comprising administering a compound or agent that modulates a function or activity of an SV2 protein.

Group II, claim(s) 6-19, 29-33 and 61-63, drawn to a method of discovering or modeling an interaction between an SV2 protein and levetiracetam or analog or derivative thereof or a compound or agent which competes with levetiracetam for binding to the levetiracetam binding site.

Group III, claim(s) 20-25, drawn to a method of assaying the interaction between SV2 protein and a second protein in a cell.

Group IV, claim(s) 26-28, 34-35, 39-51 and 56-60, drawn to a method for identifying an agent that modulates a neurological disorder, comprising exposing a SV2 protein to the agent and determining whether the agent modulates an activity or expression of the SV2 protein.

Group V, claim(s) 36, drawn to an isolated nucleic acid comprising the nucleic acid sequence of SEQ ID NO: 5.

Group VI, claim(s) 37-38, drawn to an isolated polypeptide comprising the amino acid sequence of SEQ ID NO: 6.

Group VII, claim(s) 52, drawn to a pharmaceutical composition comprising a compound or agent as identified in the method of claim 47.

Group VIII, claim(s) 64-70, drawn to a method of isolating a functionally active membrane associated SV2 protein complex.

Group IX, claim(s) 71-72, drawn to a purified SV2 protein complex obtained by the method of group VIII.

The inventions listed as Groups I-IX do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons:

The technical feature linking groups I-IX is that they all relate to the binding of a compound or agent to the levetiracetam binding site of an SV2 protein. However, Noyer et al. (*Eur J Pharmacol.* 1995; 286:137-146, listed on IDS filed 03/02/2006) teaches that the drug levetiracetam, which is used for the treatment of epilepsy, binds to a specific levetiracetam-binding site in CNS membranes, wherein it elicits anticonvulsant effects. Although Noyer et al. are silent with respect to naming the membrane binding site as the synaptic vesicle protein SV2, this membrane-associated protein is intrinsically present in the crude brain membrane preparations exposed to levetiracetam as disclosed by Noyer, and thus would be present to bind to and interact with levetiracetam. Thus, the technical feature linking the inventions of Groups I-IX does not constitute a special technical feature as defined by PCT Rule 13.2, as it does not define a contribution over the prior art.

### ***Election of Species***

This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

The species are as follows:

If Applicant elects **group I**, one of the disease species recited in claims 54 and 55 (e.g., one of the specific species that is either a neurological disorder or an endocrinological disorder) must also be elected.

If Applicant elects **group II**, one of the following species of techniques involved in discovering or modeling an interaction between SV2 and a compound or agent must also be selected, along with identification of claims readable thereupon:

- a. Analysis by proteolytic treatment (as in claim 7)
- b. Analysis by 3-dimensional modeling or other purely computational techniques  
(as in claims 8, 9, 61 and 62)
- c. Analysis by binding studies (as in claim 10)
- d. Analysis by use of transgenic animals (as in claim 63)

If Applicant elects **group IV**, one of the neurological disorder species recited in claim 51 must also be elected.

Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

The following claim(s) are generic: 1, 6, 13, 26, 47, 53 and 60.

The species listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons:

The different diseases and disorders comprise a diverse spectrum of neurological and endocrinological disorders that are unique in terms of their diagnosis, etiology, pathology, and affected populations and therefore the different species do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1. Similarly, the different analytical techniques require unique reagents, equipment, steps and/or analyses and therefore the species do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To preserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does

not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder. All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not

commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.** Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

***Advisory Information***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kimberly Ballard whose telephone number is 571-272-2150. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9 AM - 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffrey Stucker can be reached on 571-272-0911. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Kimberly Ballard, Ph.D.  
Art Unit 1649

/Elizabeth C. Kemmerer/  
Elizabeth C. Kemmerer, Ph.D.  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1646